section 112. Furthermore, prior art cited (Patent #6,297,548) claims show how the semiconductor device inside the chip package is mounted to the enclosure, whereas Applicants claims are for how the enclosure is mounted to external structures such as walls, panels, DIN rails and other enclosures. The prior art only demonstrates how components can be stacked inside of the enclosure, whereas Applicant claims how to attach and stack the enclosures.

Claims 2-4 is submitted as allowable over the cited reference for the same reasons as above based on their dependancy, and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Reguarding Claim 6, prior art cited (Patent #6,297,548) shows the components internal to the enclosure being stacked and aligned but makes no mention of stacking chip package enclosures upon each other, as this would be impossible in the BGA device show due to the solder balls on the bottom surface. The prior art only demonstrates how components can be stacked inside of the enclosure, whereas Applicant claims how to stack the enclosures. Claim 6 is submitted as allowable over the cited references and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Prior art cited (Patent #6,297,548) makes no mention of ergonomic features, and a beveled edge or angled corners are not ergonomic in nature, as they continue to have a sharp angle. The edges would need to be rounded, as in Application, to comform to ergonomic guidelines. Claim 7 is submitted as allowable over the cited references and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Other US Patents sited have been reviewed but do not demonstrate prior art pertinent to applicants disclosure, as none discuss the attachement, support, alignment, or ergonomics of an electronics enclosure.

Therefore it is submitted that patentable subject material is clearly present. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, appliant respectfully